St Alban's Catholic High School

Exams Malpractice and AI Policy

(including the use of AI)

Approved by Full Governing Body

Recommission Date: September 2027

MALPRACTISE (Exams)

Including the use of AI

2026/27

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of Centre	**Mr S Corless**
Senior Leader(s)	**Mrs S Morris**
Exams Officer	**Ms M Mattis**

The 11-19 Exam Malpractice Policy

Staff Malpractice Statement

Introduction

This statement sets out the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally.

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated.

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Tampering with candidates work prior to external moderation/verification
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

The following are examples of malpractice by staff regarding examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone/i-phone/smart watch/internet or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

Process

Such malpractice is regarded as misconduct under the School's Discipline Policy. Any allegations of malpractice will follow the disciplinary investigation, sanction and appeals processes as set out in that policy.

Candidate Malpractice Statement

Introduction

This statement sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding candidate malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and regarding examinations marked externally. Attempted, or actual malpractice will not be tolerated.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing off as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only
- Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor – This may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Talking during an examination
- Taking a mobile phone or smart watch such as Apple watches, or equivalent, into an examination
- Taking any item other than those accepted by the Awarding Body into the examination, such as a

book or notes
- Leaving the examination room without permission
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate

Irregularities in internally assessed components of examinations discovered prior to the signing of declarations of authentication need not be reported to the Exam Board. The Centre may instead decline to accept the work for assessment purposes.

If an irregularity is discovered by the Centre after the signing of declarations of authentication, full details of the case must be submitted to the Exam Board at the earliest opportunity. The matter will then be treated as a formal case of suspected malpractice.

Irregularities discovered by the Exam Board will be reported to the Centre.

Under the terms of JCQ (Joint Council for Qualifications) Regulations, candidates who breach the Regulations may be disqualified from subjects for which they have been entered in the current examination series.

St Alban's Catholic High School is committed to adhering to the rules and regulations as set out by JCQ and the Exam Boards. All matters of suspected malpractice will therefore be thoroughly investigated by the School, and the Exam Board will be notified.

The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Assessments

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. Most of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs) for General Qualifications, coursework, and internal assessments. This section is primarily intended to provide guidance in relation to these assessments.

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

· As has always been the case, and in accordance with JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/general-regulations/), all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the student's own

· Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions

· Students and Centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice

· Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student, and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded

· Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the student's own

· Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI, but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.

What is AI Misuse?

· Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the students'

own
· Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
· Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the students' own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
· Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
· Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

Detection and Identifying AI Use.

Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in students' work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms, and other localisations*
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level*
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability
- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the student's usual style.

*Please be aware that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content.

Reporting and Investigation

If AI misuse is suspected by a teacher or reported by another student or member of the public, it must be reported immediately. The subject department will confirm if the student in question has signed a declaration of authentication, if at this initial stage the student has not signed the stated form, the centre is not required to report this matter to the relevant awarding body and will deal with the case internally.

If a suspected student has signed a declaration of authentication document, then the relevant awarding body will be notified and will liaise with the Head of Centre to conduct a full investigation.

The procedure is detailed in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures document (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/).

Sanctions and Consequences

The sanctions applied to a student committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity include but are not limited to:

- Students' marks may be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment
- Disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for several years

Awarding bodies will also take action against the Centre, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where Centre staff are knowingly accepting or failing to check inauthentic work for qualification assessments.

For further information please follow the below links:

JCQ-AI-poster-for-students-2.pdf